

ARMY AND NAVY CHRONICLE.

VOL. 1.

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1835.

No. 16.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY, BY

BENJAMIN HOMANS,

AT THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

* Two copies will be furnished one year—or one copy for two years, for five dollars.

† All communications to the editor must be post paid.

Army.

OFFICIAL.

HEAD QUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 17th, 1835.

ORDER, }
No. 15. }

The Court of Inquiry instituted by direction of the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, which convened on the 28th of February, 1835, in the City of Washington, pursuant to "Order" No. 8, for the purpose of examining into the conduct of 2d Lieut. John P. Lane, of the 4th Regiment of Artillery, in reference to an assault alleged to have been by him made on the person of the Hon. John Ewing, a member of Congress from the State of Indiana, while returning from the House of Representatives, on the evening of the 26th of February, 1835, in the City of Washington, has reported the following opinion:—

"The Court, after a full inquiry, find the material facts disclosed by the evidence presented, to be as follows:—"

"In the afternoon of February 26th, 1835, immediately after the adjournment of the House of Representatives for the day, the Hon. John Ewing, a member of that body, was proceeding on foot in the direct route from the Capitol towards his lodgings in this City; when, at a little distance from the Capitol Square, he overtook, on the Pennsylvania Avenue, Lieut. Lane, who was loitering or walking slowly in the same direction. When Mr. Ewing had nearly come up with him, Lieut. Lane turned round, and, accosting Mr. Ewing in a mild tone of voice, stated, in terms, his purpose of inflicting punishment or chastisement. Mr. Ewing having naturally manifested surprise and resentment at this declaration, and showing a disposition to defend himself, Lieut. Lane, with a slender iron cane, of less than six ounces in weight, hastily struck Mr. Ewing just above the left eye. The blow cut the skin of the forehead, causing an effusion of blood and momentary staggering. This advantage in the contest does not appear to have been followed up by the assailant. On the contrary, he remained firm in the same position. Mr. Ewing also had a walking stick in hand, of the description called a *sword-cane*. This, as soon as he had recovered himself a little, he attempted to use, when the wooden case, or scabbard, immediately flew off. He next endeavored to revenge himself with the naked blade, or rapier; but this was broken in a few trials, either by being parried by Lieut. Lane's stick, or by his hands. After the first blow inflicted by Lieut. Lane, he appears to have acted mainly, if not entirely, on the defensive. His stick flew out of his hand early in the conflict, when, remaining in his position, he continued to defend himself, either with his hands, against the blows and thrusts aimed by Mr. Ewing with his rapier, or, with his fist, he knocked Mr. Ewing back, on his attempts to close in. On one occasion, when Mr. Ewing came within the guard of Lieut. Lane, the latter took the former, whose hat had fallen off, by the hair, and gently shook him. Another witness added that Lieut. Lane struck Mr. Ewing at the same time. This incident terminated the contest, which happened within the view of many witnesses, members of the House of Representatives, and who were more or less distant from the scene."

"It does not appear that the parties used, or had about them, any weapon, other than the sticks described."

"The evidence but very slightly discloses the cause, or provocation which led to the assault made by Lieut.

Lane. No witness could trace it to any thing said or done by Mr. Ewing, in the honorable House of which he was a member. One of the gentlemen examined, who had been a member of the same House, testified, that on being called upon by Lieut. Lane, about a week before the conflict, as a friend, to bear a note to Mr. Ewing, demanding that the latter should withdraw something said by him, on some former occasion, he, the witness, distinctly understood from Lieut. Lane, that the offence complained of was not given by Mr. Ewing in his representative character. On the other hand, Mr. Ewing strongly testified before the Court, (having been requested to attend as a witness, in common with many other members of Congress,) that he never had had the slightest personal altercation with Lieut. Lane, or an unpleasant interview with him, prior to the encounter now under the consideration of this Court. It is proper to add, that Lieut. Lane was induced, by the persuasion or advice of his friend, not to send the note mentioned, to Mr. Ewing."

"Lieut. Lane, at the time he stated to Mr. Ewing, the purpose of punishing or chastising the latter, assigned no cause for that intention. On the termination of the conflict, he declared that his purpose had been publicly to disgrace Mr. Ewing, and added, that he had (in his view of the case) so disgraced him."

"The Court, in common, no doubt, with the whole Army, probably including Lieut. Lane himself, deeply regret the rash transaction, the particulars of which have thus been briefly recapitulated."

"By the Constitution of the United States, it is declared that members of Congress 'shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to or returning from the same.'"

"The cases here enumerated show the high importance the people and the States attach to the uninterrupted services of their representatives in the two Houses of Congress, and if those representatives cannot be hindered from attendance, not even by the process of the Courts of law, in some criminal, and in all civil cases, it would seem against the spirit, if not the letter of the Constitution, that officers set apart for the armed defence of the nation, and under the highest obligation to support the Constitution, should be at liberty, from any cause, to prevent the attendance of members, by inflicting injuries on their persons."

"The conduct under consideration seems to be equally hostile to the spirit of the fifth Article of War, in which Congress has enacted, that no officer shall use disrespectful words against the Congress of the United States, under the penalty of being severely punished by a Court Martial."

"The Court of Inquiry will not say that Lieut. Lane might be arraigned for the conduct in question, under this Article of the Rules and Articles of War, because its strict construction may only apply to disrespectful words uttered against the members of the two Houses collectively, and not against an individual member. The Article is cited only to show the spirit of the legislation of the country on the subject, and as serving to mark that deference or forbearance which military men owe to the National Legislature, and, by consequence, to its members individually, whilst the latter are engaged in the performance of their high functions."

"In conclusion—it may not be proper or expected, that this Court should say, that, in its opinion, there is, or is not, ground for sending the case to a General Court Martial; but, whatever may be its impression on this point, it is sincerely hoped that nothing similar will ever again occur for legal investigation, or public censure."

WINFIELD SCOTT,

Major General and President of the Court."

II. The proceedings in the foregoing case having been submitted to the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, the General in Chief has received, through the War Department, the following directions of the PRESIDENT thereon:

"WASHINGTON, March 12th, 1835.

SIR: I have perused with great care, the proceedings of the Court of Inquiry in the case of Lieut. Lane, of the United States Army, accused of having committed an assault and battery on the person of the Hon. John Ewing, a member of Congress from the State of Indiana. The cause which led to the unpleasant difficulty between these gentlemen, does not appear from the evidence, in positive terms; but it may be inferred, from the testimony of the Hon. Robert T. Lytle, of Ohio, that it arose from remarks made by Mr. Ewing, relative to some absent members of the family of Lieut. Lane. But, on the other hand, in contradiction to this, is the testimony of Mr. Ewing. Be the cause what it may, the attack of a military officer of the Government, on a member of Congress, during its session, was highly improper, and deserves reproof; but, as neither the Committee of the House of Representatives, nor the Court of Inquiry, by whom the whole matter has been examined, have thought the conduct of Lieut. Lane deserving further investigation, the Secretary of War will cause the result to be made known, by General Orders, as a public reprimand to Lieut. Lane, and direct him to be relieved from his present duty, and report to his Regiment.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,
ANDREW JACKSON."

"THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

III. Lieutenant Lane's appointment of Assistant Quarter Master, is accordingly revoked. He will be relieved from duty at the Delaware Breakwater, and proceed to join his Company without delay.

The Court of Inquiry is dissolved, and the members thereof will repair to their respective stations.

BY ORDER OF ALEXANDER MACOMB,
Major General, Commanding in Chief:
ROGER JONES,
Adjutant General.

CASE OF LIEUTENANT LANE.

A CARD.

I respectfully call the attention of officers of the Army to the following official copy of the record of the Court of Inquiry, constituted to investigate my conduct.

The proceedings are without a precedent in our military history. The rules of evidence applied in framing the statement of facts, and the constructions of law set forth in the opinion, present questions deeply affecting our rights as citizens and as officers.

The high rank of the members of the court renders this case a guiding authority for the future. It becomes us to carefully examine the questions presented, that the rules adopted may be corrected, if erroneous, or fully made known to us, if consistent with law.

I trust that my failure to enter a formal dissent will not be deemed an acknowledgment on my part of their correctness. Whatever my opinions may have been, I have respectfully submitted to the proceedings, by the Committee of Congress and by the Court of Inquiry. So far from delaying or preventing them by legal objections, I have endeavored to facilitate their progress.

I have not objected to the receipt of Mr. Ewing's testimony, while I have waived my own right to be examined as a witness. I have not chosen to exhibit my private griefs, real or imaginary, to explain or justify whatever may have been thought exceptionable in my conduct; and have respectfully insisted on suffering such penalty as the opinion of the court might warrant. To the severe penalty inflicted in consequence thereof, I have cheerfully submitted. I have

sacrificed my feelings, and perhaps my rights, to remove an unfounded prejudice against the army, that was supposed to have been created.

Although my motive may justify my passiveness, the case should not be allowed to pass silently into a precedent that may hereafter operate most injuriously upon others. I cannot suppose for a moment, that the proposed examination will be unacceptable to the gentlemen who composed the court.

An eminent jurist (Livingston,) whose equitable systems of evidence and procedure, apply most readily to military courts, deems it not only a right, but a duty, to fully examine and discuss the opinions and decisions of those acting as Judges. The duty in this instance is rendered imperative by what is due to our rights, not only as officers, but as citizens.

J. F. LANE.

Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, convened at Gadsby's Hotel, in the City of Washington, on the 28th day of February, 1835, in obedience to the following Order, viz:

"HEAD QUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.
Washington, 28th February, 1835.

ORDER,)
No. 8. }

The President of the United States directs that a Court of Inquiry, to consist of Major General Scott, Brigadier General Brady, and Brigadier General Wool, will assemble this day at 12 o'clock, (noon) at Gadsby's Hotel, for the purpose of examining into the conduct of Lieutenant John F. Lane, of the 4th Regiment of Artillery, in reference to an assault alleged to be by him made on the person of the Honorable John Ewing, a member of Congress from the State of Indiana, while returning from the House of Representatives, on the evening of the 25th of February, 1835, in the City of Washington.

Major Thomas F. Hunt, of the 5th Regiment of Infantry, will act as recorder.

The court will report all the facts in the case, and its opinion thereon.

BY ORDER OF MAJOR GENERAL MACOMB:
(Signed) R. JONES,
Adjutant General."

Present—

Major General WINFIELD SCOTT, President.
Brigadier General Hugh Brady, } Members.
Brigadier General John E. Wool, }
Major Thomas F. Hunt, Recorder.

The order having been read, the oath prescribed by the 93d Article of the Rules and Articles of War, for the members of a Court of Inquiry, was administered to the members by the recorder, and that prescribed by the same Article for the recorder, was administered by the President to him.

The court was therefore duly organized.

Lieutenant John F. Lane, of the 4th Regiment of Artillery, whose conduct is to be examined into, was in attendance on the court.

A letter was addressed to the Honorable John Ewing of Indiana, a member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, couched in the following words and figures, viz:

GADSBY'S HOTEL, No. 91,
February 28th, 1835.

SIR:—The President of the United States has ordered a Court of Inquiry to investigate an alleged assault upon the Hon. Mr. Ewing, a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, said to have been made by Lieut. Lane of the Army, on the 25th or 26th instant.

This court, of which Major General Scott is the President, is now in session, and has directed me to request your attendance as a witness, and also to furnish the court with the names of other witnesses of the transaction.

The court will probably sit till five o'clock this evening, and then adjourn to 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

If, from any cause, it should be inconvenient for you

to attend the court room, as above, the court will visit your lodgings to receive your testimony at any hour you may be pleased to appoint.

I have the honor, Sir, to be with respect,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) THO. F. HUNT,
Major by brevet, 5th Reg't. of Infantry,
Recorder of the Court.

To the Hon. JOHN EWING, of Indiana,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States."

Which said letter was delivered to the Hon. Mr. Ewing in person, by the recorder of the court.

General John Thomson, of Ohio, a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says:—On the evening before the last, after the House of Representatives adjourned, I was proceeding to my lodgings. I had gone about half way of the Botanical Garden, as it is called, on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue. I was alone. I was overtaken by Mr. Ewing of the House of Representatives; he came up to me on my left hand, and was saying something to me in relation to the weather. He then said something as we were walking together, in relation to the proceedings of the present Congress. Just as he had said that, we were met by Lieut. Lane, who came up at the side of the pavement on which Mr. Ewing was. When he came up close to him, he said in a low tone of voice, Mr. Ewing, "I am under the necessity of punishing you," or "chastising you;" I do not recollect the expression precisely, but words conveying that meaning. I heard no more of the conversation between them. Having gone eight or ten steps forward, I turned round and saw Mr. Ewing striking at Lieut. Lane with his cane. After he had struck at him, and perhaps struck him, I saw the scabbard part of his, Mr. Ewing's, case fly off, leaving the sword naked. Mr. Ewing then made some thrusts at him with the sword, which Mr. Lane parried off with his left hand. Mr. Ewing finding then, that he could not stick him, struck at him with the sword several times; after he had used it as a cane some time, it, the sword, either broke or separated from the handle, which I do not know; then Mr. Ewing with his fist, struck at Mr. Lane a number of times, which Mr. Lane parried off, he standing still, and who did not make any attack on Mr. Ewing, but seemed to be defending himself. About that time, Mr. Ewing finding that he could make no impression on Mr. Lane with his fist, stooped down and picked up the scabbard part of the sword cane, with which he struck at Mr. Lane several times, and I think he did strike him once on the shoulder; the remainder of the strokes Mr. Lane parried with his arm until that part of the cane fell from his, Mr. Ewing's hand the second time. About the time Mr. Ewing lost the scabbard part of the cane, I saw Mr. Lane take Mr. Ewing by the hair of the head, as Mr. Ewing approached Mr. Lane a second time, with the left hand, and give him a gentle shake, and I was surprised Mr. Lane did not throw him down, as Mr. Ewing appeared to be very much exhausted by his previous efforts. About that time hostilities appeared to cease on the part of Mr. Ewing, and I saw Mr. Lane, with his hands in his side pocket, pass diagonally to the other side of the Pennsylvania Avenue, leaving Mr. Ewing with the crowd that had collected around him.

Question by the Court.—What weapon had Lieut. Lane in his hand?

Answer.—When he came up he had in his hand what I supposed to be a small whale bone cane, something larger than a goose quill.

Question by the Court.—Which of the parties, the Hon. Mr. Ewing, or Lieut. Lane, struck first?

Answer.—I do not know. I did not see Mr. Lane strike Mr. Ewing at all.

Question by the Court.—Did the witness hear Lieut. Lane specify the cause of offence which induced the threat addressed to the Hon. Mr. Ewing?

Answer.—I did not hear Mr. Lane say another word, further than the sentence or half sentence which I have already stated.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did not Mr. Lane speak to Mr. Ewing in the usual manner?

Answer.—He did—he addressed him with how do ye Mr. Ewing, in a mild and pleasant voice, and apparently with a pleasant countenance.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Was the word used by me "necessary" or, "under the necessity?"

Answer.—I have already said that I am not certain which; it was one of them.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did Mr. Lane advance upon Mr. Ewing, at any time after you turned round?

Answer.—I saw no other advance, after I turned round, than reaching out his left hand and taking him by the hair of the head, as I have said before; Mr. Lane was standing perpendicularly; Mr. Ewing was fighting all the time and seemed to be doing his best.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did not Mr. Lane's object seem to be merely to disarm Mr. Ewing; and was not his whole conduct that of great forbearance towards Mr. Ewing?

Answer.—It so appeared to me; and I was really astonished if his object had been to hurt him, that he had not done more.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you perceive Mr. Ewing thrust his hand into his breast pocket, and attempt to draw a pistol on Mr. Lane?

Answer.—I did not.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Was Mr. Ewing armed with pistols?

Answer.—I do not know.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you hear Mr. Ewing use any abusive language as Mr. Lane left?

Answer.—I did not. I was standing in my first position all the time, about eight or ten steps from the parties.

In conclusion, the witness states that he had had no formal introduction to, nor personal acquaintance with Mr. Ewing, until the evening before the rencontre took place, at which time he overtook him in the same way as already stated; and he says he was not acquainted with Lieut. Lane until about three or four weeks ago, when he was introduced to him, and since that time he has not spoken to him until now.

(The court adjourned to meet again at 10 o'clock on Monday morning, March 2d, 1835.)

GADSBY'S HOTEL,
Washington City, March 2d, 1835.

The court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present—

Major General SCOTT, President.
Brigadier General Brady, } Members.
Brigadier General Wool, }
Major Thomas F. Hunt, Recorder.

After the adjournment of the court on Saturday, the 23th of February, to wit, on the 1st of March, yesterday, the recorder of the court received a communication couched in the following words and figures, viz:

"WASHINGTON CITY,
March 1st, 1835.

SIR:—Your note of the 28th ult., informing me that a Court of Inquiry had been convened in the case of the assault made upon me by Lieut. Lane, was the first intimation I had of such a proceeding, and with all due respect for the honorable court, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I disclaim being considered in the light of a prosecutor. I however conceive it to be due to the respect I entertain for the honorable court, and also to the high character and honor of the Army, that I should, in accordance with the wishes of the court, give my testimony in the case; and as I am not in a situation to attend the court, I shall be ready to receive them at my room to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) JOHN EWING.

Major THOMAS F. HUNT,
Recorder of the Court."

The Hon. Benj. Hardin, of Ky., a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says:—I think it was on the evening of the 26th of February, the House of Representatives adjourned about sunset. The members of Congress whose boarding is west of the capitol, started pretty much in a crowd together; at the head of the Avenue, some went down on the left hand side of the Avenue, and the larger part on the right hand side. When I got to about opposite the centre of the Botanic Garden, I looked across the Avenue and saw two men fighting; I instantly recognized one to be Mr. Ewing, a member of Congress from Indiana. I started across the Avenue as fast as I could go, but was somewhat interrupted by hacks which delayed me. When I got to where they were, they were separated, and I think about ten feet apart. I looked Mr. Ewing in the face, and found that he was

hurt a good deal, but how much I do not know, because I did not examine. The young gentleman who had been engaged with him, remarked, "I have done what I intended," and he used either the word "I have punished," or, "I have caned," I do not know which, precisely, but think "caned" was the word, and "disgraced you," meaning Mr. Ewing. He then, I think, said "I will go," and started to go, and then I remarked, he should answer for it. He then started across the Avenue, rather diagonally; myself and others pursued in a fast walk. When the young gentleman struck the foot pavement, he started to walk down the pavement, and did walk about thirty or forty yards; he called to a hack to come and take him in; when the hack drove up, he stopped; myself among others of the crowd told him he should not go. Mr. Moore, a member of Congress from Virginia, caught hold of him by the coat, and told him to stand, and remarked, "a man has got hold of you now, and you shall stand;" upon that the young gentleman looked me in the face, and remarked, "Mr. Hardin, I know you; my name is Lane;" and then stated the place where he boarded, and said that he would not depart, but would answer any charge or demand that might be brought against him; his look and manner were such as to satisfy me that he would, and in a moment he was permitted to depart. The fight took place on the direct path from the House of Representatives to where Mr. Ewing boards. When I saw them, they appeared to have been engaged for a moment or two, and when I got up, I saw the fragments of a cane in Mr. Ewing's hand. I saw nothing in Mr. Lane's.

Question by the Court.—Did the witness hear Lieut. Lane assign the reason or motive for the attack upon Mr. Ewing?

Answer.—I did not, further than I have stated.

Question by the Court.—Did the witness at the carriage perceive any weapon in the hand of Lieut. Lane?

Answer.—None at all.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Was Mr. Lane's manner calm?

Answer.—His manner did not show great agitation, and appeared to understand very well every word he said.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you observe any thing "dastardly" in Mr. Lane's conduct?

Answer.—Nothing at all.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Were not these the exact words used by Mr. Lane—"My purpose is equally well accomplished, by punishing you; you are publicly disgraced?"

Answer.—I am not able to answer the question in any other manner than I have stated; it is possible in the bustle, I have not given the exact words, although I believe I have.

The Hon. Robert Mitchell, of Ohio, a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says:—The evening the attack was made, I was coming down the Avenue alone. I overtook Mr. Ewing and Mr. Thomson, about the middle of the Botanic Garden. I heard Mr. Ewing make use of an expression in relation to this session of Congress. I inquired of General Thomson what it was that he said. At that instant Lieut. Lane came up to Mr. Ewing, who was walking on the extreme left of us, as I supposed to shake hands. Mr. Ewing stopped—General Thomson and myself proceeded. As we left him, Mr. Ewing, I understood Mr. Lane to say, "I owe you a chastisement," or "I will take this opportunity of chastising you," or words to that effect. General Thomson and myself proceeded on six or seven steps; General Thomson observed to me, "there will be a scrape," on which we both stopped and turned round. During the engagement, I saw Mr. Ewing strike Lieut. Lane, and Lieut. Lane strike Mr. Ewing, and Mr. Ewing's forehead bleeding. Mr. Lane had, as I thought, a whale bone rattan, and Mr. Ewing had a sword cane, with which they struck each other. By some means Mr. Lane lost his rattan, I do not know how. Mr. Ewing in striking Mr. Lane, the lower part of his cane flew off; after which Mr. Ewing made one or two passes at Mr. Lane with the sword part of his cane, which Mr. Lane parried off. Mr. Lane retreated, stepping backwards five or six feet. Mr. Ewing closed in on him, and struck him with the point of the sword on the shoulder, as I believe, and broke it; Mr. Lane retired again a few feet; Mr. Ewing approached him again, at which time Mr. Lane caught him by the hair of the head, and gave him one

or two strokes with his fist. I do not know which of them commenced the attack. During the engagement Mr. Ewing observed to Mr. Lane, "you scoundrel," or "rascal," and pitched at him; this was the last of the affray.

Question by the Court.—Did the witness hear Lieut. Lane state the cause or provocation of the attack made upon Mr. Ewing?

Answer.—No.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Were not the usual salutations exchanged between Mr. Ewing and Mr. Lane?

Answer.—I do not know. Nothing of anger appeared on the part of either of them at that time.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—What was the tone in which Mr. Lane spoke?

Answer.—In a common tone I should suppose.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you hear distinctly, the conversation between Mr. Ewing and Mr. Lane, previous to the commencement of the contest?

Answer.—No, or I would have no doubt in regard to the words used by him. I heard no more than I have before stated, and that was only a part of a sentence as I supposed.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—May not the following be the sentence in which you heard the word chastise—"I fear I shall be under the necessity of punishing, or chastising you, unless certain parts of your conduct are explained, or atoned for?"

Answer.—It might be, but I am not certain.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you not consider Mr. Lane's life in danger, in the contest?

Answer.—I did when those passes were made at him.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you hear Mr. Ewing utter any answer to the remark of Mr. Lane?

Answer.—No.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—What abusive language did Mr. Ewing make use of towards Mr. Lane, at the close of the contest?

The court objected to the question being answered, it being irrelevant.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you see Mr. Ewing thrust his hand into the breast pocket of his over coat, at the outset?

Answer.—No.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Was Mr. Ewing armed with pistols at the time?

Answer.—I do not know.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Is it not the general rumor that Mr. Ewing is armed with pistols?

Answer.—I never heard of it previous to the attack; but have subsequently heard one or two say that it was rumored that he was armed at the time of the attack.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did you observe in Mr. Lane's manner or conduct, any thing dastardly?

Answer.—No.

Question by the Court.—You have said that you are not certain. Did you hear any other words or expression than those which you have stated in the forepart of your testimony; that is, at the first meeting of Mr. Ewing and Mr. Lane?

Answer.—I do not recollect that I did.

The Hon. Mr. Hendricks, of Indiana, of the Senate of the United States, being duly sworn, says:—Not being present at the affray between Mr. Ewing and Mr. Lane, I know nothing of my own knowledge.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Is not Mr. Ewing passionate and hasty in his temper?

Answer.—He is.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Please to state how long you have known Mr. Lane, and whether he is one whom you would think likely to causelessly involve himself in a personal difficulty?

Answer.—I have known Mr. Lane from boyhood, and previous to this transaction I should not have expected him, causelessly, to embroil himself in personal difficulties.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Please to state what you deem to be Mr. Lane's temper?

Answer.—I should consider Mr. Lane's temper mild. In connection with another difficulty between the father of Lieut. Lane, and a person other than Mr. Ewing, I feared the imprudent interposition of Lieut. Lane, and requested Mr. Wardwell to say to him that I wished to see him. I saw Mr. Lane a few days afterwards at the Senate chamber, who informed me that Mr. Wardwell had not delivered my message. I told him my object was to caution him against imprudent interferences in the difficulties of his father, and believe I mentioned

what passed in debate, between his father and Mr. Ewing, as well as the other person. Lieut. Lane assured me that he had no intention of any interference in the matter, and said that a note to which reference was had in the conversation, was written without any intention of giving the least offence to the person to whom it was written. I considered Lieut. Lane in this conversation, to assure me that he would by no means interfere in such things; and I exceedingly regretted to hear of his conflict with Mr. Ewing.

Question by Lieut. Lane.—Did Mr. Lane then exhibit any excitement in reference to the difficulty between Mr. Ewing and Mr. A. Lane?

Answer.—No, he did not.

The Hon. Mr. Hiestor, of Pa., of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says:—On Wednesday or Thursday last, as I was returning from the Capitol, when about opposite to the centre of the Botanic Garden, I observed some fifty or sixty yards in advance of me, two persons scuffling, or fighting. When I got a little nearer, I recognized one of them to be Mr. Ewing, of Indiana; the other, a stranger, the person I now believe to have been Lieut. Lane. By the time I had got up to them they had got apart, separated some little distance. Mr. Ewing, with a part of a cane in his hand, holding it at the lower end, near the ferrule, advanced towards Mr. Lane and struck at him with great violence. Mr. Lane parried the blows with his open hands, having no weapon in his hands at the time. Some person at the time, a stranger to me, said they should desist; there was enough of it, or words to that effect. Mr. Ewing then retreated. Mr. Lane kept his stand for another moment, and remarked "I have attained my object; I meant publicly to disgrace you, and have done so;" or words as near as I can recollect to that effect, and then walked off, crossing the street diagonally. Mr. Ewing had a gash above the left eye, and appeared to be considerably hurt, bleeding profusely from the wound. About that time, some one picked up a piece of steel about eight or ten inches in length, which appeared to be a part of a sword, belonging to a sword cane. I do not know how it came there, or who used it, if used at all.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Did Mr. Lane appear desirous of injuring Mr. Ewing any farther than was necessary to repel Mr. Ewing's attacks?

Answer.—No—Mr. Lane stood on the defensive at that time.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Do you not consider that Mr. Lane's life was in danger from Mr. Ewing's attack?

Answer.—At the time I came up I should say Lt. Lane's life did not appear to me to be in danger, although Mr. Ewing struck at him with part of his cane with great violence.

At this stage of the proceedings Lt. Lane made known to the court that he had received a communication informing him that the Committee of Investigation, of the House of Representatives, would meet at 1 o'clock, and would receive any communication he might have to make—whereupon he was informed by the court that his attendance on the committee must be given. In the course of the remarks consequent on Lt. Lane's announcement, and in connection with the two investigations continuing at the same time, Lt. Lane expressed to the court his desire that both investigations should proceed.

The examination of the honorable Mr. Hiestor was resumed, Lt. Lane deferring his departure for the Committee of the House of Representatives until its close.

Question by Lt. Lane.—May not these have been the precise words used by Mr. Lane—"my object is equally well attained," or "accomplished by publicly disgracing you—you are so disgraced?"

Answer.—The words were, as near as I can recollect, as already stated.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Was it not the general rumor that Mr. Ewing is habitually armed with pistols?

Answer.—I have no knowledge as to that matter.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Did you observe any thing dastardly in Mr. Lane's manner or deportment?

Answer.—Mr. Lane's manner appeared to be remarkably cool and collected under the circumstances of the case, having reference now to the last attack made upon Mr. Lane by Mr. Ewing.

The recorder of the court was instructed to call on the Hon. Mr. Ewing, and to say to him that the arrival at the court room of several witnesses whose testimony

in the case the court desired to avail itself of, accounted for the court's not having visited his lodgings at the time indicated in his note of the 1st of March, instant—and, also, to inform him that the right of cross examination was secured to Lt. Lane by the law, and that, therefore, it would be necessary for Lt. Lane to be present at the taking of his, Mr. Ewing's testimony.

The recorder returned and reported that he had obeyed the instructions of the court, and that the Hon. Mr. Ewing objected to Lt. Lane's coming into his quarters at all, and that, had he been aware of the necessity of Lieut. Lane's presence at his examination by the court, he would have replied to the letter written to him by direction of the court, in a manner different from that in which he did reply—but he had no objection to the counsel of Lt. Lane being present.

(The court adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow, Tuesday morning.)

GADSBY'S HOTEL,
Washington City, March 3d, 1835.

The court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present—

Major General Scott, President.
Brigadier General Brady, } Members.
Brigadier General Wool, }
Major Thomas F. Hunt, Recorder.

Lt. Lane waived his right of being present this morning at the examination of witnesses, on account of being compelled to attend the Committee of Investigation, of the House of Representatives.

The Hon. L. Lincoln, of Mass., a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says—I was passing from the House of Representatives on the day on which the assault was committed towards my lodgings on the left hand side walk of the Penn. Avenue, when my attention was arrested by the stopping of several of the gentlemen who preceded me; as I advanced, I perceived that two persons were engaged in an affray, neither of whom at the time did I recognize. I passed off the side walk on to the street, and as I came nearly opposite to those persons, I recognized Mr. Ewing, of Indiana, a member of the House of Representatives, as one of those persons—he was then attempting to strike the other person with the end of a small piece of stick or cane—I do not know what kind it was, which he held in his hand, twelve or sixteen inches long, while the other person at the same time was striking at him—the face of Mr. Ewing was very bloody at that time—they immediately separated or stood apart from each other. Mr. Ewing upbraided the person, with whom he had been engaged, with having made a cowardly attack upon him—he replied “I have accomplished my object”—“I intended publicly to disgrace you, and I have done it.” In the mean time I had stepped upon the side walk, and the person with whom Mr. Ewing had been engaged passed directly by the off side way on to the street followed by several persons, among whom was Mr. Hardin of Kentucky. I remained till I saw Mr. Hardin near to Mr. Lane, and, as I supposed speaking to him. I saw gentlemen assisting Mr. Ewing, and I passed on to my lodgings.

Question by the Court.—Was there any thing said by the party whom you saw in conflict with the Hon. Mr. Ewing, which went to show the cause of the attack made upon the latter?

Answer.—I heard not a word except what I have repeated, I probably came up at the close of the affray.

The Hon. H. A. Muhlenburgh, of Pennsylvania, a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says—Returning from the Capitol on Thursday evening last, I observed two persons about ten or twelve yards ahead of me engaged in a personal contest—canes appeared to be used on both sides for a short time, then a dirk or sword by one of the parties whose back was turned to me—three or four desperate lunges were made at the person facing me—the sword then was either broken or wrested from the person using it—after this the elder of the two made three or four onsets on the younger, who stood on the defensive with great coolness and self-possession—believing the contest then over I passed the parties perhaps eight or ten yards, turning round I thought I recognized Mr. Ewing, of Indiana, who was bleeding from some wound received on the forehead—Mr. Ewing then made another onset—his blows were parried as before—in making another the young gentleman took

him by the hair of the head and shook him—perceiving that a number of gentlemen had collected around the parties I walked on. I think the younger of the two persons was Lt. Lane, of the Army, whom I have seen in this court. At the time that Mr. Ewing was using such desperate efforts against Mr. Lane, I thought the life of the latter was in the most imminent danger and peril. I do not recollect that I heard any words pass between the parties, except perhaps, Mr. Ewing said “you damned rascal.”

Question by the Court.—When the younger of the parties took the elder by the hair, did the witness observe that that action was accompanied by any blow from the younger?

Answer.—I think not. At the time Mr. Lane took Mr. Ewing by the hair, Mr. Lane's back was to me.

The Hon. Robert Burns, of New Hampshire, a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says—As we, myself and other members, were walking down the Avenue, we were attracted by the scuffle between Mr. Lane and Mr. Ewing; immediately on my observing them I supposed they had hold of each other—a moment after they separated, and Mr. Ewing had in his hand the butt end of a cane—within about six or eight feet of them I stopped. Mr. Lane stepped back and Mr. Ewing attempted to strike him with the piece of cane he held in his hand—Mr. Lane fended off the blow, and struck Mr. Ewing with his fist—Mr. Lane had nothing at the time in his hand—the same attempt was made three or four times by Mr. Ewing, and those attempts parried by Mr. Lane, who struck Mr. Ewing each time that he advanced, with his fist—Mr. Lane did not, I believe, move from his position after stepping back as before stated—at the last attempt Mr. Ewing made to strike, Mr. Lane seized him by the hair of the head—at this instant a number of members advanced towards them, and Mr. Lane crossed to the other side of the street—as he let go of Mr. Ewing, he said words to this effect—“I have disgraced you and that answers my purpose,” or, “that is all I intended.” I picked up a pair of spectacles on the side walk, which I supposed to be Mr. Ewing's, the glasses were broken, and they were bloody. I called and delivered the glasses to Mr. Ewing on, I think, Saturday following, when I had some conversation with him. He asked me if I had seen the affair between him and Mr. Lane. I told him, and I have stated to him what I had seen in substantially the same terms as I have above used. Mr. Ewing stated that Mr. Lane accosted him, saying this is Mr. Ewing. He replied it is. Mr. Lane then said, he wished some conversation with him, and alluded to some difficulty which he, Mr. Lane, said existed between them. He did not at first know Mr. Lane, but then recognized him—Mr. Lane remarked he would make him answer for it, or he would disgrace or punish him; which of these words he used, I do not recollect. Mr. Ewing observed he was a damned puppy or rascal, or words to this effect, to accost a gentleman in that way in the street. Mr. Ewing, fearing that Mr. Lane might attack him, was about putting some papers which he had in his hand, into his pocket, when Mr. Lane struck him over the eye with an iron cane—he, Mr. Ewing, at this time attempted to strike Mr. Lane with a sword cane—on the first or second blow the sheath flew off—he then advanced upon him with the naked blade, which was immediately broken in a manner he could not account for. Mr. Ewing observed that when Mr. Lane first accosted him, he, Mr. Lane, had his cane under his arm, and his hands in his pockets.

(The court adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow, Wednesday morning.)

GADSBY'S HOTEL,
Washington City, March 4th, 1835.

The Court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present—

Major General Scott, President.
Brigadier General Brady, } Members.
Brigadier General Wool, }
Major Thomas F. Hunt, Recorder.

The recorder was instructed to call on the Hon. Mr. Ewing, of Indiana, with a view to some definite understanding in regard to the court's obtaining his testimony.

The recorder returned into court and reported that he had seen the Hon. Mr. Ewing, who stated that he would attend the court at its room at 1 o'clock to-day

if he could, but if he could not attend at that time to-day, he would at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Lt. John F. Lane was in attendance on the court this morning.

The Hon. Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, a member of the House of Representatives, being duly sworn, says—On Thursday evening last, immediately after the adjournment of the House, I was passing on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to my lodgings—my attention, by some unusual noise, was called to the opposite side of the way, where I saw Mr. Lane and Mr. Ewing of the House, as it appeared to me, about twelve feet from each other—and pieces of a cane or walking stick lying between them, Mr. Ewing immediately after I saw the parties, seized one of the pieces of cane, advanced upon Mr. Lane and struck him—Mr. Lane warded off the blow with his left arm, and, I think, gave Mr. Ewing a blow with the right—Mr. Ewing renewed the attack and was again repulsed in the same manner—when Mr. Ewing again advanced, Mr. Lane seized him and forced him back a few paces—until this time, as it appeared to me, Mr. Lane kept his position, standing upon the defensive and repelling the attacks of Mr. Ewing. After the last encounter (as stated above) Mr. Lane left the pavement and walked deliberately across the Avenue to the side where I was standing. I did not see the beginning of the affray—and the above are all the circumstances that fell under my observation.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Did you observe any thing in Mr. Lane's conduct in the affair, “dastardly” or “cowardly?”

Answer.—Since he was engaged in the affray his bearing was, as it appeared to me, that of a brave man. (The court, at near 2 o'clock, P. M. adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow, Thursday morning.)

GADSBY'S HOTEL,
Washington City, March 5th, 1835.

The Court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present—

Major General Scott, President.
Brigadier General Brady, } Members.
Brigadier General Wool, }
Major Thomas F. Hunt, Recorder.

John K. Poor, of the City of Washington, being duly sworn, answers to interrogatories.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Was the cane, produced in court, purchased from you by Lt. Lane?

Answer.—Yes.

Question by Lt. Lane.—What kind of a head was on it?

Answer.—An ivory head—about an inch across the top—it was rounding on the top, and about an ounce in weight.

Question by Lt. Lane.—What was the length of the cane, and with the head, its entire weight?

Answer.—A yard and a quarter long—with the head its weight is between five and six ounces.

Question by the Court.—Have you ever weighed a cane of the description of the one now in court and of the same dimensions?

Answer.—I have.

The Hon. John Ewing, of Indiana, being duly sworn, answers to interrogatories.

Question by the Recorder of the Court.—Will you please state to the court, the particulars of the recent conflict between yourself and Lt. Lane?

Answer.—In passing down the Avenue on Thursday evening the 26th ult., immediately after the adjournment of the House, and when in front of the Botanic garden, I discovered before me a man loitering leisurely along—I was at the time in conversation with the Hon. Mr. Thompson, of Ohio, and walking at a quick pace—when we overtook the person before-mentioned, and were passing him, he remarked “Mr. Ewing, I think,” or, “Mr. Ewing, I believe,”—I answered “Yes, sir,”—his face when I spoke was averted from me—and after making another step passing on, he remarked, “I have a few words to say to you, Mr. Ewing,”—I stopped an instant, and then passed leisurely on a few steps with him—Mr. Thompson being some steps ahead, when I asked, “what do you desire to say to me,” or words to that purport. “Sir, I desire to tell you that I have to punish you,”—this was his answer and these his words, to the best of my recollection—when he made this declaration, I distinctly recognized him to be the son of Amos Lane, and I need

not describe the feelings of surprise and indignation, his declaration excited—I held in my right hand a cane with which I invariably walked, and in my left, a bundle of papers just received from the Post Office—and while giving vent to an exclamation, “punish me,” and placing the papers into the pocket of my surtout, I received a blow above the left eye, as I believe, from the leaden head of a steel cane, which staggered me and confused my brain, and obstructed my vision. I quickly raised my cane to ward off his second blow, and received it partially on the forefinger of my right hand, and struck at him immediately afterwards.

My cane had a small spear which was disengaged from its case, by this blow, and finding, from his manner and weapon, that his object was my life, I approached him with my naked spear, which striking against some hard substance, was broken off at the hilt, and left nothing but the handle in my hand—a scuffle ensued, which the spectators will be able to relate with more accuracy than myself. Finally the crowd intervened between us, and I called “give me a cane to punish the dastardly ruffian”—he then turned round, being distant from me some steps, and remarked as he stepped off, “I have accomplished my purpose,” or words to that effect. It is here proper to declare that I never had any unfriendly interview or altercation whatever, with my assailant, and was at the time of the assault, utterly ignorant and unsuspecting of his entertaining any enmity or illwill towards me.

Question by the Court.—Did Lt. Lane assign any cause or provocation for the assault you have described?

Answer.—None whatever, further than what I have said that reached my ear.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Was the blow referred to as having obstructed your vision, the one causing the cut over the left eye?

Answer.—It was.

Question by Lt. Lane.—In what pocket did you thrust your hand?

Answer.—The left hand side pocket of my surtout.

Question by Lt. Lane.—When was your cap knocked off?

Answer.—I wore a hat—I am not conscious when it fell—I presume I lost it and my spectacles at the same time.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Was Mr. Lane’s face averted until the instant before the conflict began?

Answer.—I did not discover his face nor recognize him until he replied to my inquiry “what do you wish to say to me”—he then turned his face and I recognized him.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Did you raise your cane as you stepped back and thrust your hand into your surtout pocket?

Answer.—I did not raise my cane until after I received the first blow—and then I was in the act of putting the papers in my pocket.

The Hon. R. T. Lytle, of Ohio, being duly sworn, answers to interrogatories.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Please to state what you know of the course intended to be pursued by Mr. Lane in reference to the late difficulty between Mr. Ewing and himself.

Answer.—About two weeks ago, as near as I can recollect, I was called on by Lt. Lane of the Army, and requested to present a note to Mr. Ewing, of Indiana, a member of Congress, demanding an explanation, or rather a withdrawal of certain offensive language said to have been used in reference to the absent members of his family, distinctly placing the ground of complaint upon matters different from the difficulty then supposed to exist between his father and Mr. Ewing; for reasons which I explained to the satisfaction of Lt. Lane, I declined at that time being the bearer of his note, inasmuch as there was contained in the note a determination to have satisfaction in some other way, in the event of a refusal to comply with his demand to explain away the remarks complained of. I understood Lt. Lane as acquiescing in my advice to postpone the matter to some future period, if not to abandon the application for redress as then proposed by him in that way. Lt. Lane did not express to me what precise course of action he meant to pursue afterwards, nor did I advise any particular course of action in reference to the matter.

Question by Lt. Lane.—Did the witness understand from Lt. Lane, at the time, that any part of his resent-

ment or complaint against Mr. Ewing was founded on any thing said or done by the latter in his place as a member of Congress?

Answer.—Neither from the tenor of the note which was presented to me by Lt. Lane, nor from any explanation which he gave me, could I fairly infer that such was the fact.

Question by the Court.—Do you know, or have you reason to believe, that the supposed assault of Lt. Lane upon Mr. Ewing was in consequence of the alleged offensive language of Mr. Ewing against the absent members of Mr. Lane’s family?

Answer.—I would suppose that the assault was committed in consequence of the cause assigned in the interrogatory, knowing of no other. I was absent during the debate between the father of Lt. Lane and Mr. Ewing, at which time, as I have understood, some angry feeling was elicited. I have not even read, however, the report of that debate, up to the present time—I say this, not because of its application to the case in hand, but as a matter of satisfaction to myself.

The evidence in the case being closed—Lt. Lane asked of the court that he might be permitted to present a written statement, or commentary, on the evidence—it was decided by the court that such statement, or commentary would be received.

(The court adjourned to 11 o’clock to-morrow, Friday morning.)

Poetry.

SELECTED.

SAILOR’S HYMN.—BY MRS. SIGOURNEY.

When the parting bosom bleeds,
When our native shore recedes,
When the wild and faithless main
Takes us to her trust again,
Father! view a sailor’s woe—
Guide us whereso’er we go.

When the lonely watch we keep,
Silent, on the mighty deep,
While the boisterous surges hoarse
Bear us daily on our course,
Eye that never slumbers!—shed
Holy influence on our head.

When the Sabbath’s peaceful ray
O’er the ocean’s breast doth play,
Though no throngs assemble there
No sweet church-bell warns to prayer,
Spirit! let thy presence be,
Sabbath to the unresting sea.

When the raging billows dark,
Thundering toss our threatened bark,
Thou, who on the whelming wave,
Didst the weak disciple save—
Thou who hear’st whene’er we pray,
Jesus! Saviour! be our stay.

When in foreign lands we roam,
Far from kindred and from home,
Stranger eyes our conduct viewing,
Heathen-bands our steps pursuing,
Let our conversation be,
Fitting those who follow Thee.

Should pale death, with arrow dread,
Make the ocean-cave our bed,
Though no eye of love might see
Where that shrouded grave shall be—
Christ! who hear’st the surges roll,
Deign to save the sailor’s soul.

On Tuesday, March 24th, the Bishop of the N. York Diocese laid the corner stone of St. John’s Church, Fort Hamilton, Long Island, on a beautiful site presented by the late owners of the Denyse estate. The address was delivered by the Reverend Hugh Smith, of N. Y. The interest of the occasion was increased by the presence of the troops attached to the Fort, and the accompaniment, in the solemnities, of their Band.

WASHINGTON;

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1835.

The Board of Officers mentioned in our last number, have completed their labors and adjourned.

Lieut. J. F. Izard, of the Dragoons, has arrived at New York, a passenger in the ship *Angelique*, from Charleston, S. C.

Lt. Col. E. Cutler, of the 5th Infantry, will relieve Lt. Col. I. B. Crane, as Superintendent of the Eastern Recruiting Department, on the 30th Sept. next.

ARRIVALS AT WASHINGTON.

April 8.—Captain J. Howard, Army, at Gadsby’s.

Major D. Randall, left for New York.

Lt. A. R. Hetzel, Army, at Mrs. McPherson’s.

14.—C. Little, M. Storekeeper, Georgetown.
Lt. G. Dutton, Army, Fuller’s.

Extract of a letter from an officer on board the *Frigate Potomac*, to his friend in Washington, dated
MAHON, 22d Feb. 1835.

“The *Shark* has been ordered to sail this morning for Marseilles, and is now getting under way. We shall all sail immediately upon her return; ’tis said for Naples, though we shall doubtless proceed up the Archipelago. We are all well. The French are hovering round us; whether for good or evil we know not.”

LITTLE ROCK, (ARK.) March 24.

The s. b. *Lafourche*, arrived this evening, from New Orleans, having on board about 170 U. States recruits, from New York, on their way to Fort Gibson, in charge of Capt. THOMAS and Surgeon BAILEY.

A detachment of 63 U. S. Dragoons, under the command of Lieut. A. M. LEA, passed down, this morning, in the s. b. *Neosho*, from Fort Gibson, on their way to join the Companies to which they belong, at Fort Leavenworth, on the upper Missouri, and Fort Des Moines, on the Upper Mississippi. They compose that portion of the Corps, who were left sick at the time their Companies marched to the north, in September last, and are now, we understand, generally in good health.

The other military passengers, who passed down in the *Neosho*, from Fort Gibson, were Dr. GATLIN, under orders for Fort Jackson; Lieut. DIX, 7th Inf., on Topographical duty, for Washington City; and Lieut. HARRIS, of the 7th Inf., for mouth of White river.

“HORSE SHOE ROBERTSON.”—We perceive from the newspapers that John P. Kennedy, Esq. of Baltimore, author of the “Swallow Barn,” is about to publish a novel entitled “Horse-Shoe Robertson;” and it is stated by the New York Commercial Intelligencer, that “this Robertson was a character well known in the Revolution, which he long survived,” and that the novel is founded on history. It is also stated that “the time is that of the Tory ascendancy in the South, under Cornwallis, from the surrender of Charleston to the battle of King’s Mountain.”

It is perhaps not generally known that this Horse-Shoe-Robertson is still living, and resides within a few miles of this place, (Tuscaloosa, Alabama.) He is an old Revolutionary soldier, who passed through deeply interesting scenes in “the times that tried men’s souls.” He is universally known by the name of Horse-Shoe Robertson; but we have forgotten how the name originated. He is a highly esteemed citizen, now, or recently, in bad health. He has a number of sons in the country, who are also men of high standing. A keeper of a public house informed us just now that some of them were in the habit of bringing the best kind of beef to market.—*Tuscaloosa Expositor.*

Communications.

THE NEW INFANTRY TACTICS.

No. 4.

Before proceeding to the "School of the Battalion," we have to notice the method prescribed for carrying the sword by officers; and as it is the only one laid down, we presume that it is to be used on all occasions.

It is as follows:—"The Carry. The gripe in the right hand, which will be supported against the right hip, the back of the blade against the shoulder." Now we venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that the above paragraph was translated, without giving a moment's consideration to the form of the present regulation sword. This, as every one knows, is a straight *two-edged* weapon; and if any person will but take the trouble to draw it, he will easily perceive that it has no *back*, and that it cannot possibly be held in the manner prescribed, even were that edge opposite the guard, considered for the time being as the back. One has only to make the experiment, to be fully convinced, that he could not well hold his arm in a stiffer or more awkward position; and that the attempt would not only subject him to useless pain, but also render him constantly liable to cut and injure his uniform. So much for the carry itself.

We next object to the silence observed concerning the position of the sword at an order; and also to the abolition of the present method of carrying it across the body, when out of the ranks. Nothing contributes so much as this, to the bracing up of the whole person; giving it a firmness and confidence under arms, which is in the highest degree desirable. When we have remarked, that the *tattoo* appears to have been overlooked amongst the established drum-beats, we have brought our comments upon the School of the Company to a conclusion.

School of the Battalion.

Paragraph 790. "The Colonel wishing to cause ranks to be opened, will command: 1, *Prepare to open ranks*."

791. At this command, the Lieutenant Colonel and Major will throw themselves on the right of the battalion, the first on the flank of the file-closer, and the second four paces behind that point.

792. The Colonel, seeing the Lieutenant Colonel and Major nearly in position, will command:—2, *To the rear, open order*. 3, *MARCH*."

The object of "*prepare to open ranks*," appears to be to enable the Lieutenant Colonel and Major to arrive in season at the right flank of the battalion; but this strikes us as entirely useless, since the second command is actually given before they reach that point. Even were it otherwise, "*To the rear, open order*," is all that is necessary as a caution: since, did the field officers step off at this intimation, the movement would combine simplicity of command, with quickness of execution.

In par. 808, we find "1, *Stack-Arms*. 2, *Break ranks*. 3, *MARCH*;" to which we object, for the reason, that the moment arms are stacked, and the word "*Break*" given, the men will disperse without waiting for the rest of the command. It is therefore useless; while the word "*March*" is positively incorrect, since it is applied to an action the very reverse of marching; as sitting down, sauntering, running, &c.

"*By the right of companies, to the rear into column*," &c., offers an instance of a command unnecessarily precise; and one which will be constantly liable to be improperly given. It would be difficult at any time, to make officers so exact in the set phrase of speech, as is here required; but striking them, as it must, as uselessly long, combined with their confirmed habit of giving, "*By right of companies, rear into column*," (which is essentially the same,) it would be absurd to expect any thing else than confusion from the new command. We are well aware, that the distinguished compiler of the work under consideration, has been shocked on more than one occasion, by what has appeared to him to be a clipping of the words of command; but we would respectfully observe, that this extra precision will be far from remedying the evil of which he has complained.

Paragraph 867, strikes us so singularly, when compared with one on the same subject, in the present

Tactics, that although in reality, a matter of very little consequence, we cannot resist our inclination of placing them side by side.

"*Remarks on filing to the rear into open column*."

886. This manœuvre will be employed when want of room prevents wheeling forward, as prescribed in the preceding article; and as often as the pivot flank is to march on the prolongation of the line from which it was formed."—[Tactics of 1825, page 138.]

"*Remarks on breaking to the rear by the right or left into column*."

867. This manner of breaking into column, being at once the most prompt and the most regular, it will be employed on actual service in preference, unless there be some particular reason for breaking to the front." [New Tactics, page 112.]

It would be amusing to learn what were the circumstances in these piping times of peace, which led to the discovery mentioned in the last paragraph.

Par. 870. To play the battalion into mass by division, in rear of the first, the Colonel will command: "1, *Close column by division*. 2, *On the first division, right in front into column*. 3, *Battalion, right-FACE*. 4, *Quick—MARCH*."

In the second command, "*into column*" is unnecessarily repealed, since it is impossible to form close column from line, in any other way than by coming into column.

The command of "*Guides cover in file*," which occurs in par. 984, carries upon its face, both novelty and nonsense: since it is not only strange in itself, but destroys every thing like the usual meaning attached to the word *file*. Our idea of this matter has always been, that the men who composed a file, should not only be ranged one behind the other, but should also be immediately contiguous; and never farther from each other, than the position which they would occupy with ranks opened. The next command of "*Guides on the line*," covers this movement, and the one for which it is used, and can always be employed for both, without confusion; since it is only necessary in the one case, to establish two guides on the line, and in the other, to arrange the color-bearer and general guides, before giving the command for the whole.

"*To half distance, close column*," presents an example of a transposition of words, with no other apparent object than that of mere change; since, in the first place, it does not improve the present command of "*column, close to half distance*," and is moreover a violation of that analogy, which it is so desirable should characterise every combination of similar movements.

A column closed in mass, will be countermarched by the command and means prescribed as follows: "1, *Countermarch*. 2, *Battalion, right and left—FACE*. 3, *By file left and right*. 4, *Quick—MARCH*." The odd and even divisions face in opposite directions; both guides of each face about; the men file round then without moving out of the column; the whole dressing by the right, when the right is in front; to effect which, the chiefs of the even division, shift from the left to the right of the column, after countermarching. The dressing being finished, the chiefs of divisions and the guides resume their posts. We have already commented, in part, upon this movement, in the school of the company, and we shall now confine ourselves to the consideration of its objectionable features, as applied to the battalion. By countermarching within the flanks of the column, nothing but crowding and confusion will ensue, particularly with three ranks; for although the distance between the guides is proportionally increased, yet from the fact of the divisions being obliged to file round them, more room will be necessary than is required at present, where they march out of the column.

The evolution also labors under the disadvantage of useless bustle and movement; since the captains of even divisions must pass from one extremity of their divisions to the other, in order to dress them, and afterwards resume their posts in front, with the risk of being run over by both the guides, who are obliged to cross the captain's and each other's paths, in retaking their proper stations.

We can only think of one case where it would be really necessary to countermarch in this manner; and that is, when a battalion finding itself in a narrow road, or defile, a change of direction to the rear should sud-

denly become desirable. But the objections to the whole manœuvre, are so serious, that even in this case, we conceive that it would be much better, and quite as expeditious, to face by the rear rank, and march off in that direction, until a sufficient space should be obtained to effect the countermarch, by filing out of the column. When we have added, that the arrangement laid down under the same head, (par. 1089) making a division of flank companies *odd*, for this particular movement; thereby disorganizing the whole battalion; and rendering it a matter of uncertainty, whether the rear divisions are odd or even: we have completely exhausted both our patience and our remarks, upon this absurdly confused and heterogeneous manœuvre.

"*Being in column, by company closed in mass, and at a halt, to form divisions*."

Under this head we have to notice a singular innovation in the second command of "*Left companies, left—FACE*."

This is an unmeaning and useless departure from the uniform practice of designating companies by the character of their numbers, as odd, or even. It is unmeaning, inasmuch as when a battalion is drawn up in column, one company is no more a *left* company than a *right* one, and it cannot be considered as such, until the manœuvre is performed. But it is always either an odd or an even company, no matter what may be its position; and since it is so designated in every other instance, we cannot discover any reason for changing it.

In par. 1130, there is a manifest mistake. "*Left—DRESS*" being given, instead of "*Right—DRESS*."

"1171. The head of the column being at company distance from the two markers established on the line, the colonel will halt the column, and command: "*Forward into line*. 2, *By company, left half wheel*. 3, *Quick—MARCH*."

Without saying any thing more of the first command, than that it is an alteration in word, but not in sense, from that of "*To the front into line*;" we shall proceed to consider the subject of "*left half wheel*." This, we have no doubt, is a literal translation, and was adopted without a moment's consideration of its utter uselessness. For that such is the case, is clearly evident from par. 1173, which directs that when the colonel judges that the companies have sufficiently wheeled, he shall command: "4, *Forward*. 5, *MARCH*. 6, *Guide right*."

This single fact is enough to show the complete insignificance of the word "*half*;" and to prove that this was also the opinion of others, we have only to state that it was left out of the Tactics of 1825, when those of 1815 were revised by the board of compilers.

We should have observed before, that in par. 1151, and several succeeding manœuvres, the word "*FRONT*" is omitted, after dressing.

We next come to the passage of obstacles, where we find several novelties, which we shall proceed to consider.

The obstacle being supposed to cover the third company, the colonel will command: "*Third company, obstacle*," the brevity of which we acknowledge and admire.

"1375. At this command, the captain of the third company will place himself in its front, turn to it, and command: 1, *Third company, by the left flank, to the rear into column*. 2, *MARCH*. He will then hasten to the left of the company." After filing to rear parallel to the fourth company, it marches to the front, by the command, "*Third company*. 2, *By the right flank*. 3, *MARCH*. 4, *Guide right*;" the captain taking post in front of the centre. We enter our solemn protest against so great a violation of common usage and common sense; for if the principle is once admitted, that a company can march by a flank, in any other direction than towards its extremities, there will be no limit to the monstrous absurdities into which we shall be plunged. Although the movement itself is analogous to that of the passage of obstacles, by two or more companies; still, it may fairly be questioned, whether the advantages resulting from this arrangement, are not more than counterbalanced, by the awkwardness of breaking to the rear; the loss of distance while marching in column; and the subsequent unwieldy method of coming into line; which last is done by one of these *half wheel* movements, of which we have before spoken.

CLAIRFAIT.

REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

MR. EDITOR: Allow me through your very valuable paper, to call the public attention to the "Revenue Cutter Service," a service which with a little attention from Government, might be of more immediate benefit to the commercial community than any corps under the Government. I wish to be understood, when I say "more immediate benefit;" i. e., these vessels properly manned and disciplined are ready, at a moment's warning, to assist the merchant vessel in any situation, and by so doing the immediate benefit will be at once perceived. These vessels, to be of the service that is expected of a home squadron, and to perform the duty that the law requires of them, should be properly manned and properly disciplined. The discipline of our noble Navy should be introduced and rigidly enforced, as well among the officers as the men; (and I regret exceedingly to say, that most of the former appear to think, that discipline was made for the latter, and not themselves.) This done, with increased crews, a service could soon be raised, that would be of great benefit to the country generally, in time of peace as well as war. Nothing, however, can be done, unless the Government takes their case into consideration, reorganizes the corps, and places the service upon a respectable footing with the Army and Navy. I will state the present number of vessels, force, &c., &c., with the hope that some officer in the Army or Navy will not refuse to afford this service his assistance and good wishes for its advancement.

The number of vessels is twenty—eight of the first class, eleven of the second, and one of the third class. Those of the first class have each one Captain, three Lieutenants, (commissioned 1st, 2d, and 3d) and twenty-one men, including Boatswain's Mate, Gunner's Mate, Carpenter's Mate, Cook, Cabin and Ward Room Stewards, and six boys. The second class—one Captain, three Lieutenants, and eighteen men, including Boatswain's Mate, Gunner's Mate, Carpenter's Mate, Cook, Cabin and Ward Room Stewards, and four boys. Third class has one First Lieutenant Commanding, one Third Lieutenant, and eight men. Each Cutter is also entitled to a Pilot, when there is no officer sufficiently well acquainted with the cruising ground; the number of pilots is sixteen; making in all, seventy-eight officers, sixteen pilots, and three hundred and and seventy-four men—total four hundred and sixty-eight. The armament is various; some mount four, some six guns; some brass, some iron, from 4 prs. to 12 prs.; some long, some short, some medium, and some carronades. The vessels are generally, however, well supplied with muskets, pistols, cutlasses, and boarding pikes, and are (without any exception) the first vessels of their class in the world; fast sailers, beautiful and roomy, but still unable to act in concert, for the want of a code of private signals and the knowledge of the true discipline, where rank or date of commission takes precedence, and an "Esprit du corps," so essentially necessary for the well-being and advancement of every service.

During the administration of Secretaries Ingham and McLane, much was done for the service, much contemplated, and much promised, which would have been done, provided those gentlemen had remained longer at the head of the Treasury Department. Mr. Duane, I am informed, (and I believe correctly) contemplated making the service what it ought to be, called a Board of Officers to Washington, (consisting of three Captains) for the purpose of reorganizing the corps. Their deliberations have never been made public, and I would respectfully ask, what has become of their Code of Regulations? It is true, that a new set of Regulations has been given them by the present Secretary; but what kind of Regulations are they, I would ask? Any thing to raise the corps, either in the estimation of the Public, or the Officers themselves? Nothing.—On the contrary, much has been done to put it down; their crews reduced, and the little power the commanders possessed has been taken from them, and given to men, that are totally unacquainted with vessels or their wants. I shall never forget the feelings that were depicted in the countenance of one young Commander, as the new Regulations were put into his hands. He immediately turned to the crew list—"Fourteen men—my hopes are blasted, and instead of seeing the service raised, as I have been often promised it should be, and after spending a number of years of the best part of my life in it—to see it thus"—his heart was too

full; he turned and walked away. The next day saw his beautiful little vessel, with her topgallant yard across—stripped to her lower masts, and yards sent on shore, because he had not men enough to work them. Drummer and fifer, with eight seamen, were discharged, and the little man-of-war sunk to a level (except in the feelings of the officers) with a well regulated coaster. As for assisting vessels in distress, that was entirely out of the question; these cutters are very heavily rigged, and it requires all the men, at present allowed, to handle them; to send men away to assist another, it would be necessary to bring the vessel to an anchor, which could not be done when the vessels generally require assistance the most. Is this service unpopular with the commercial community, that it should not be fostered? No! on the contrary, the ship owners and masters are anxious the service should be kept up; that the vessels should be strongly manned; and if any difficulties occur with their crews, or if their vessels are in distress, they know where to apply for assistance. To the Cutters—since my knowledge of the service, many vessels have been saved, with many lives, and many more would have been saved, provided they had had what is required, and what I now ask for them—reorganization, with increased crews.

This is my first attempt (and perhaps you may say, I hope the last) to write for a public print. I am as well aware of my incapacity for writing, as you will be, after having read this article. But I could not rest, until I had made the attempt (however futile) to bring this subject before the public, with the hope, that able men would take it into consideration, and do something for a service that might be made so beneficial to the commercial community and the country at large.

EFFINGHAM.

UNITED STATES' NAVAL HOSPITAL, }
near Pensacola, Feb. 18, 1835. }

DEAR SIR: I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 11th instant, in which my opinion is requested on certain points relative to the salubrity of Pensacola. It will afford me great pleasure at all times, to give you such information as I may possess, and in attempting on this occasion to comply with your wishes, I will begin by stating your questions:

"1st. Is there any natural cause in the situation of Pensacola to render it subject to bilious or yellow fever?"

"2d. What seem to be the causes of the visitation of bilious and yellow fevers to Pensacola about once in six or seven years, after intervals of perfect health?—Can these causes be remedied, and how? and at what probable expense?"

"3d. Is, or is not, the climate of Pensacola especially beneficial to persons suffering from diseases of the chest—equally so with St. Augustine—and much more so than New Orleans, Mobile, or any Southern cities situated on rivers, or affected by fresh water air?"

The natural causes of bilious and yellow fevers in Pensacola are extremely few, situated as it is on an arid plain, remote from any fresh water river.

The chief element in the generation of diseases, is decayed vegetable matter. If animal matter be added, the cause will be more active, and the disease will be somewhat modified. Heat and moisture must be superadded to these. The scrubby oak, the dwarf pine, and the fine sand of Pensacola, proclaim their inadequacy to the production of vegetable matter, the essential ingredient, and indeed, the *sine qua non* of the cause of yellow fever. The stream which nearly encircles the city, it is true, gives life and vigor to a growth of shrubbery, but the shrubbery is evergreen, and its leaves only drop gradually and singly, (being continually renewed by other leaves,) and are instantly immersed in that lively little stream which is ever gushing from its bed, or they find a screen from the rays of the sun in the thick shade that covers it. These springs of water are remarkable for their purity and softness: they commence nearly opposite the centre of the city, and running in different directions, form an estuary with the waters of the bay, one above, and the other below the city, about a mile from each other. It is to be observed, that the breadth of this springy ground varies from ten or fifteen, to one hundred, and even two hundred yards, and generally, though not throughout, it is a purely sandy bottom. There are some few

spots only, in which rich mud is largely mixed with the sand.

This part of the subject will be left for the present, to be reverted to in the consideration of the second question. And here, I must dissent from the admission, that bilious and yellow fevers do visit Pensacola often as once in six or seven years; as I do not find on record any account of these diseases reigning here previous to our times, except those given by Dr. Lind, which occurred in 1765. This author, however, only informs us that a mortal sickness prevailed in a regiment newly arrived from England. He does not mention that it affected the inhabitants, and states, that on board the ships in port every person enjoyed good health. Some of the old inhabitants of Pensacola, who are noted for accuracy of observation, inform me that they had the fever in 1811; these two, added to the visitations of 1822, '27 and '34, seem to constitute the sum of its history here, both written and traditional.

We have in possession certain facts, which lead with great readiness to the answer of the question, "What seem to be the causes of the visitations of the yellow fever to Pensacola?" And the most striking and important one is, that neither this disease nor any of its family has ever occurred here, except in consequence of the absence of rain in July and August. This circumstance is of exceedingly rare occurrence, so much so, that those months are proverbial for being prolific in copious showers accompanied with thunder and lightning. Yet it cannot be admitted, that dry weather alone at the period above mentioned, will with certainty bring yellow fever at Pensacola; for although the springs above described, become rather lower and leave some dead vegetable substances exposed to a high temperature, those of us who are familiar with their copiousness cannot conceive that there is ever sufficient pabulum supplied from this source alone to impregnate the atmosphere with deleterious effluvia. The nuisances of the city create other impurities in the air, which united with the exhalations from the margins of the streams, form a poison sufficiently concentrated during unusually dry seasons to cause yellow fever. No one acquainted with Pensacola will deny that the back yards of a majority of the inhabited lots exhibit a fearful accumulation of "unclean things," which remain undisturbed equally by the police and by the occupant. From the proximity of the springs to the surface, the sinks are shallow, and are very liable to overflow and "scatter their orders to the winds." There can be but little doubt that the mass of rotten sea-weed which lay upon your strand all last summer, the stench of which is still strong in our recollection, should be added to the list of city nuisances.—It will be readily suggested to any one how easily these substances may be removed, and their qualities neutralized. Fifteen years ago the city of Baltimore was visited annually with sporadic cases of yellow fever. They had their origin in local causes, which were pointed out by members of our profession, and removed by an enlightened police. Professor Potter, of the University of Maryland, has repeatedly said in his lectures that the time was not far distant when communities would be so well informed on the subject of the fevers in question, that it would be considered criminal in the authorities to allow them to occur in large cities. This prediction is now almost literally verified in his own city. This gentleman has treated the subject more ably than any other writer, in a little work "on Contagion," a work which will hand his name down with freshness to succeeding generations.

The following observations tend to prove that without the superaddition of local causes found in the town itself to the malaria of the marshes, yellow fever would be unknown at Pensacola.

1st. Yellow fever never originates in the vicinity of Pensacola—not even on the very margin of the marshes, where the population is sparse.

2d. It never originates among the shipping at the anchorage, directly opposite the town. The Falmouth ship of war furnished only two cases of it to the hospital last summer, and they were officers, who probably contracted it in town. The schooner Grampus, it is true, suffered from the disease while lying in port, but she had all the materials for its causation, as it was proved, in the decayed and decomposed state of the plank of her ceiling. It appeared on board this vessel

15 days previous to the existence of any signs of it at Pensacola.

In confirmation of the opinion that the marsh effluvia alone of the place is not sufficient to produce the disease in question, it may be appropriate to add the following facts. The east and west villages of the Navy Yard are equally exposed, as it regards the bay and the small ponds in the rear. One of them fronts the bay on the east, having a series of small ponds west of it, the other fronts the bay on the south, and has the ponds on the north. The ponds in question were dry fast summer, and their bottoms presented to view a thin layer of mud. The east village did not furnish a case of sickness last autumn; but in the south village eight or ten cases of yellow fever occurred within a few hours of each other, and two of them died. The south village had the disadvantage of a slaughter house situated immediately in its rear, which was exceedingly offensive. The Navy Yard, equally exposed with either village, to the effluvia of the ponds, remained perfectly healthy, with the exception of the case of one gentleman, who had a slight attack, traced to Pensacola. I was an observer here, in 1827, when no case originated at the Navy Yard, nor at either village.

It has been represented to me upon good authority, that the swamp or shrubbery of the springs of Pensacola was cleared up in 1811 and 1822. We all recollect that streets were opened through in 1827, and I think it was partially cut up again, the summer before last. These are certainly remarkable coincidences. It cannot be conceived that insalubrity would follow these clearings, provided the ground were put under cultivation, but clearing without cultivation has the effect to expose the surface to the rays of the sun and heat, and probably to produce an evolution of unhealthy effluvia, which otherwise might have remained quiescent.

The causes of yellow fever, at Pensacola, therefore, are local, and are within the power of your police.—They can be remedied with a little attention to cleanliness, and at a very trifling expense. The successful means, used by many cities in the United States, which were formerly visited almost annually, by this scourge of the human race, confirm our views of the nature of these causes, and inspire confidence in the efforts of man, for their removal.

For your third question, I have but little room left. Indeed, I could scarcely hope to do justice to the subject, in the space allotted to this communication, and as I propose to resume it on some future day, I will content myself with stating it as my belief, that this is the finest climate upon the globe, for consumptive persons, and offer for your consideration, two facts only. 1st, I have never known nor heard of a case of consumption originating here. 2d, I have known several desperate cases, to be cured here, with very little medical treatment.

When Don Juan Ponce de Leon came in search of this country, he sought a spring, the waters of which were to rejuvenate man.

The fable which gave spirit and animation to his enterprise, like most others among rude nations, had certain truths for its basis. The fountain of health, if not of youth, has a real existence here, and in the extent of benefits it is destined to dispense to the human family, the bright visions of the Spanish hero will be more than realized. I am respectfully, and truly yours,

ISAAC HULSE.

To Walter Gregory, Esq., Pensacola.

U. S. DRAGOONS.—On Monday last, a company of eighty fine looking young men, enlisted for the U. S. Dragoon service in the "Far West," by Capt. Sumner, arrived at this town from the Carlisle Barracks, and embarked on board of one of E. Leech's line of packet boats for Pittsburg. They will then proceed to St. Louis, and thence to such post as may be ordered by the War Department.

This is the first company of Dragoons ever recruited in Pennsylvania, and Capt. Sumner deserves great credit for his diligence in the service, and for the selection of his men. Sober habits and good character were, we understand, indispensable prerequisites to enlistment, and we doubt not that many of these young men will profit by their observation of the country to which they are destined, and become valuable citizens when the period of their services expires.—*Harrisburg Chronicle.*

Domestic Miscellany.

REVOLUTIONARY BATTLES.

The following table may be useful for occasional reference:—

Battle of Concord, April 20, 1775.
Battle of Bunker Hill, June 15, 1775.
Battle of Old Hampton, Va., where the Americans took 5 deck vessels, November, 1775.
Battle of Great Bridge, near Norfolk, Va., Dec. 18, 1775.
Battle of Fort Washington, Nov. 17, 1775.
Battle of Fort Lee, Nov. 19, 1775.
Battle of Trenton, where Washington and his army took 1000 Hessians, Dec. 26, 1776.
Battle of Princeton, Jan. 2, 1777.
Battle of Brandywine, Sept. 11, 1777.
Battle of Germantown, Oct. 4, 1777.
Burgoyne's army taken near Saratoga, October 17, 1777.
Battle of Red Banks, Oct. 22, 1777.
Battle of Monmouth, June 19, 1778.
Battle of Stony Point, July 16, 1779.
Battle of Long Island, Aug. 27, 1779.
Cornwallis and his army taken at York Town, Va., October 12, 1781.
Battle of King's Mountain, Oct., 1781.
Battle of Guilford, N. C., March 17, 1781.

COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The statements of the Register of the Treasury in relation to the commerce and navigation of the United States, for the year ending 30th September, 1834, were laid before Congress on the last day of the session, and have not yet been published. We, however, learn from our correspondent that the imports during that year amounted to \$126,521,332, of which there was imported in American vessels \$113,700,174, and in foreign vessels \$12,821,158. The exports, during the same year, amounted to \$104,346,973, of which \$31,034,162 were of domestic, and \$23,312,811 of foreign articles. Of the domestic articles, \$61,286,119 were imported in American vessels, and \$19,743,043 in foreign vessels.

Of American shipping 1,074,670 tons entered, and 1,134,320 cleared during the same year, ending 30th September, 1834. Of Foreign Shipping 568,052 tons entered, and 577,700 cleared.

The registered tonnage for the year ending 31st December, 1833, is stated at
Enrolled and licensed tonnage at 750,026
Fishing vessels at 825,195
30,927

Total 1,606,149
Of the registered tonnage, there were employed in the Whale Fishery, 101,158
The total tonnage of shipping in the United States, during the year 1833, was
Registered 72,979
Enrolled 88,647
161,626

The amount of Specie imported during the year ending 30th September, 1834, was also as follows:—

In Gold 4,472,507
In Silver \$17,103,550

The amount of Bullion imported during the same year, was as follows:—

In Gold 293,6650
In Silver 514,417

Comparing these statements with those of former years it will be found that in almost every particular they show an extent of commerce never before equalled in this country. The value of imports during the year ending 30th September, 1833, was 108,118,311 dollars; being more, by about five millions, than any previous year since the period immediately subsequent to the war. During the year ending 30th September, 1834 however, there was a still further increase of 18,402,021, or a total as stated above, of 126,521,332 dollars. The value of exports during the past year is 14,206,540 dollars greater than during the year ending 30th September, 1833, and greater than ever before except in 1807, when it was 108,343,545 dollars. The domestic exports during the past year were 10,716,464

dollars greater than in the previous year, and 7,179,225 dollars greater than in any former year.

The aggregate tonnage entered during the past year is 34,576 tons more than in the former year, while the American part of it is 36,771 less. There is, however, an increase in the American tonnage registered, enrolled and licensed, including fishing vessels, of 166,699 tons.—*N. Y. Jour. Com.*

MILITARY MOVEMENTS.—Yesterday, a company of U. States Infantry arrived in this city from Baltimore, the day before one from Lancaster. We learn that both these companies and a number of recruits in this city, have been ordered to New York, for the purpose of garrisoning the Fortifications at the Narrows.—*Phil. Com. Herald.*

RECEIPTS BY MAIL, &c.

ON ACCOUNT OF THE ARMY AND NAVY CHRONICLE.

[From the 8th to the 14th April, inclusive.]

8—Lt. George Dutton, Army,	31 Dec., 1833	3 00
Capt. J. Clitz,		
Capt. E. K. Barnum,	Army,	
Lt. J. J. B. Kingsbury,	Fort Mackinac,	
Lt. J. W. Penrose,	31 Dec. 1835	17 50
Lt. J. V. Bomford,		
Dr. Geo. F. Turner,		
David Jones,		
Lt. T. Morris,	Army, 31 Dec. 1835	5 00
Lt. J. M. Hill,		
H. P. Mitchell, Frankford, Pa.,	25 Feb, 1836	3 00
9—Major D. Randall, Army,	8 April "	3 00
Lt. R. W. Colcock, } do	" " "	5 00
Lt. A. R. Hetzel, } do	31 Dec. 1835	5 00
10—Col. Geo. Talcott, do	" " "	5 00
Col. Isaac H. Reed, N. Y. }	" " "	5 00
Capt. P. St. G. Cooke, Drgn's	29 Feb. 1836	3 00
Lt. A. D. Mackay, Army,	31 Dec. 1835	3 00
Lt. Geo. S. Blake, Navy,	" "	1836 5 00
11—Lt. L. E. Simonds,		
Lt. E. W. Carpenter,	Navy, 31 Dec. 1835	10 00
Purser J. N. Todd,		
N. A. Prentiss,		
13—Sergt. J. A. Spinney, M. Corps,	31 Dec. '36	5 00
Post Librarian, Fort Towson,	31 Dec 1836	5 00
		\$72 50

MARRIAGE.

In Boston, Captain THOMAS S. ENGLISH, of the U. States Marine Corps, to Miss ANNABELLA V. SIMPSON.

DEATHS.

At Fort Dearborn, Chicago, Ill., on the 6th March, of scarlet fever, CHARLES JAMES DAVIS, aged 9 years, only son of Major D. Wilcox, of the 6th regiment of Infantry, United States Army.

At Bradford, Massachusetts, Mr. ANDREW AIKEN, aged 80, a patriot of the Revolution. He fought at Bunker Hill and Bennington.

At Annapolis, Md. RICHARD HARWOOD, Adjutant General of the Maryland Militia.

On the 13th of March, near York Springs, in Pennsylvania, Major JOHN BONNER, in the 80th year of his age. He was one of the Heroes of the Revolution—was in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, White Plains, &c.—he was two years in the Flying Camp, whose duties were very severe. He retained his vigor to the last, rode out on the 12th, and on the morning of his decease arose and dressed himself—but he ceased to breathe before 9 o'clock. He was interred with Military Honors.

At New York, on the 6th instant, JAMES HAYS, aged 97, a Revolutionary hero.

At Hamden, Ohio, EBENEZER KENFIELD, aged 73, a Revolutionary soldier.

At Brooklyn, N. Y., on the 9th instant, CATHARINE SATTERTHWAITE, youngest daughter of Captain A. A. Nicholson, of the Marine Corps.